



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/630,753	08/02/2000	David C. Taylor	2852.2.1	8043

28049 7590 03/03/2004

PATE PIERCE & BAIRD
215 SOUTH STATE STREET, SUITE 550
PARKSIDE TOWER
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CUONG H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3625

DATE MAILED: 03/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/630,753

Applicant(s)

TAYLOR ET AL.

Examiner

CUONG H. NGUYEN

Art Unit

3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is the answer to the communication received on 11/13/2003.

Status of the Claims

2. Claims 1-28 are pending in this application. Claims 21-28 were elected for examinations.

Priority

3. This application has a priority date of 8/03/1999 from a provisional application S.N. 60/146878 .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sheard et al. (US Pat. 6,453,356), in view of Butt et al. (US Pat. 6,047,390), and further in view of Butt et al. (US Pat. 5,799,143) .

A. Re. To claim 21: Sheard et al. teach about classifying input text (with detailed information) from Internet and from a user, then putting them into a database having indices according to their generic meanings.

- Sheard et al. teach about gathering/mining information from the Internet to form a database having a hierarchical schema (see **Sheard**, 40:47-53); receiving text from a user as the exclusive form of user input, wherein the text is descriptive of the information sought (this is its micro-context - description of the text - by transforming/converting/selecting input data; see **Sheard**, the abstract);
- Sheard et al. teach about acquiring a macro-context (that is a term having a generic meanings, e.g., "a car" in "a Mustang convertible automobile" for the information based on the text (see **Sheard**, 40:47-53);
- Sheard et al. teach about locating/(identifying a location of) the information that matches the macro-context in a database using index (see **Sheard**, 38:47-53, and 67:8-15); and Sheard et al. teach about presenting information to a user (see **Sheard**, the abstract - "dispatching selected information content": this information are obviously dispatched to a user).

Sheard et al. do not expressly disclose about "macro-context" or "micro-context".

However, Butt et al. explain analogous meanings for these words (see **Butt** et al., '390, 1:37-45, and Figs. 7, 9-10; '143 claims 3, 6).

It would be obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Sheard et al., and Butt et al. 's disclosure because the meanings of micro-context and macro-context are clarified in mining information from Internet from Sheard et al.'s teaching, and from a user's input as in Butt et al.'s teachings.

B. Re. To claim 22: The rationales and references for rejection of claim 21 are incorporated.

Butt et al. also teach about combining relevant words in the text to form a micro-context representative of the information before acquiring a macro-context for the information (see Butt et al., '390, 1:37-45 - a micro-context is normally understood as context).

B. Re. To claim 23: The rationales and references for rejection of claim 22 are incorporated.

Sheard et al. obviously teach about acquiring a generic meaning/macro-context by comparing a plain meaning of a word (i.e., a micro-context) to an index to determine a macro-context (see Sheard, 62:66 to 64:6, and 67:8-16).

5. Claims 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sheard et al. (US Pat. 6,453,356), in view of Butt et al. (US Pat. 6,047,390), and further in view of Butt et al. (US Pat. 5,799,143), and further in view of the Official Notice.

A. Re. To claim 24: The rationales and references for rejection of claim 23 are incorporated.

Sheard et al. obviously teach about locating information that matches a generic meaning/(a macro-context) in a database comprises searching through indices in a database and returning information; by comparing a plain meaning of a word (i.e., a micro-context) to an index to determine a macro-context (see **Sheard**, 62:66 to 64:6, and 67:8-16).

The Official Notice is taken here that Shear et al. 's teachings could be applied in a relational database environment where of indices linked to generic meanings/macro-contexts.

It would be obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Sheard et al., and Butt et al. 's disclosure in view of the Official Notice in using an relational database because the availability of relational database explains a specific relationship between related components.

B. Re. To claim 25: The rationales and references for rejection of claim 24 are incorporated.

Sheard et al. obviously teach about presenting information to a user in a format selected by a user (see **Sheard**, Figs. 2-3, and 40:23-31 wherein providers would

provide information via different formats such as Internet Explorer or Netscape).

C. Re. To claim 26: The rationales and references for rejection of claim 25 are incorporated.

Sheard et al. teach about an act of gathering additional information relevant to a text from the Internet (see **Sheard** et al., 1:10-20).

D. Re. To claim 27: The rationales and references for rejection of claim 26 are incorporated.

Sheard et al. teach about an analogous act of tracking a user's navigation through the Internet with "Trace/Log Object" wherein different parameters would be used to perform analogous functions (see **Sheard** et al., 40:23-40).

E. Re. To claim 28: The rationales and references for rejection of claim 27 are incorporated.

Sheard et al. also teach a step of automatically updating the information after presenting information (see **Sheard**, 48:31-34).

Conclusion

6. Claims 21- 28 are not patentable.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CUONG H. NGUYEN whose number is 703-305-4553. The examiner can normally be reached on 7am-330 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JEFFREY A. SMITH can be reached on 703-308-3588. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-305-7687.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

Cuong H. Nguyen

CHN

CUONG H. NGUYEN
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3625